Case 2:11	cv-06738-CBM-FFM Document 110 Fil	ed 12/03/13 Page 1 of 12 Page ID #:1501	
1		·	
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
··· · · 7			
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
9	CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
10	ANITA WHITE, et al.,	CASE NO. 11-cv-06738-CBM (FFMx)	
11	Plaintiffs,	(ITIVIX)	
12	i idilitiis,	HON. CONSUELO B. MARSHALL	
13	VS.	ORDER AND FINAL JUDGMENT	
14	EDEBITPAY, L.L.C., et al.,		
15	Defendants.		
16 -			
17			
18	ORDER AND FINAL JUDGMENT		
19	On April 19, 2013, Plaintiffs Anita White and Deborah Deffenbaugh		
20	("Plaintiffs") filed a motion seeking certification of a settlement class and		
21	preliminary approval of a class action settlement [Docket No. 75] entered into		
22	between Plaintiffs and Defendants EDebitPay, LLC ("EDP"), Platinum Online		
23	Group LLC ("POG"), Dale Paul Cleveland, and William Richard Wilson		
24	(collectively, "Defendants"). The proposed settlement, which would resolve the		
25	claims asserted in this action on a classwide basis, is reflected in the Class Action		
26	Settlement Agreement and Release (the "Settlement Agreement") which was		
27	submitted to the Court on April 19, 2013 [Docket No. 75-2].		
28			
	ODDED AND BINAL HIDCMENT (11 o., 06720 CDM (BEM-A)		
1	ORDER AND FINAL JUDGMENT (11-cv-06738-CBM (FFMx))		

Plaintiffs' motion for certification of a settlement class and for preliminary approval of a class action settlement came on for hearing on May 20, 2013 at 11:00 a.m. before this Court. [Docket No. 79.] The Court, after considering the motion and reviewing the terms of the Settlement Agreement, found that the proposed settlement appeared sufficiently fair, reasonable, and adequate to warrant dissemination of class notice of the proposed settlement and to schedule a formal fairness hearing. [Docket No. 80.] The Court additionally found that the Settlement Agreement contained no obvious deficiencies and that the Plaintiffs and Defendants (jointly, the "Parties") entered into the proposed settlement in good faith, following arm's length negotiations between their respective counsel. [Docket No. 80.]

The Court granted Plaintiffs' motion for preliminary approval in an Order dated May 20, 2013 and entered on May 21, 2013 (the "Preliminary Approval Order"). [Docket No. 80.] Pursuant to the Preliminary Approval Order, the Court, among other things: (i) preliminarily certified a class of plaintiffs (the "Settlement Class") with respect to the claims asserted in this action; (ii) preliminarily approved the proposed settlement; (iii) appointed Plaintiffs as the class representatives; (v) appointed Arias Ozzello & Gignac LLP and Kronenberger Rosenfeld, LLP as counsel for the Settlement Class ("Class Counsel"); (vi) approved the form, content and dissemination of notice proposed in the Settlement Agreement; (vii) appointed KCC Class Action Services, LLC ("KCC") as settlement administrator to disseminate notice to the Settlement Class and administer the proposed settlement; (viii) ordered the dissemination of notice to the Settlement Class; and (ix) set the date and time of the final approval hearing to consider the fairness, reasonableness, and adequacy of the proposed settlement and Settlement Agreement.

On August 2, 2013, Plaintiffs filed their motion for final approval of class action settlement (the "Final Approval Motion"). [Docket No. 82.] Pursuant to the

Final Approval Motion, Plaintiffs requested final certification of the Settlement Class under Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and final approval of

3

the proposed class action settlement.

4 5

attorneys' fees, reimbursement of expenses and plaintiff incentive awards (the "Fee

On August 2, 2013, Plaintiffs filed their application for an award of

6

Motion"). [Docket No. 83.] Pursuant to the Fee Motion, Plaintiffs sought an order:

7

(i) awarding Arias Ozzello & Gignac LLP and Kronenberger Rosenfeld, LLP

8

\$250,000 in attorneys' fees and; (ii) awarding Arias Ozzello & Gignac LLP

9

\$7,518.70 in reasonable expenses that it had incurred during the prosecution of this

10

action; (iii) awarding Kronenberger Rosenfeld, LLP \$4,242.15 in reasonable

11

expenses that it had incurred during the prosecution of this action; and (iv)

12

awarding Anita White and Deborah Deffenbaugh, as class representatives, an

13

incentive award of \$2,500 each. [Docket No. 83.]

14

On August 9, 2013, the Federal Trade Commission ("FTC") filed a motion

15

for leave to file a brief as amicus curiae (the "FTC's Amicus Curiae Brief").

16

[Docket No. 84.] On August 30, 2013, Defendants filed an opposition to the

17

FTC's amicus curiae brief. [Docket No. 87.] On October 6, 2013, the Court granted the FTC's motion for leave to file a brief as amicus curiae. [Docket No.

18 19

99.] On October 8, 2013, Plaintiffs filed a response to the FTC's brief as amicus

20

curiae. [Docket No. 103.]

21

Counsel submit the following information to assist the Court in determining

On September 4, 2013, the Court issued a minute order requesting that Class

2223

whether the lodestar figure was reasonable: (i) itemized billing for all attorneys and

24

paraprofessionals that worked on this matter, organized by date and timekeeper;

25

(ii) evidence in support of the prevailing rate for each attorney and

26

paraprofessional, including citations to cases of prior awards; and (iii) biographies

27

of each attorney and paraprofessional, including how many years each professional

28

has been practicing and how long they have been practicing within their

specialized practice area. [Docket No. 90.] Class Counsel submitted the information requested by the Court on September 11, 2013. [Docket Nos. 93 and 94.]

On September 5, 2013, the Court issued a minute order continuing the hearing on the Final Approval Motion and the Fee Motion from September 9, 2013 at 11:00 a.m. to September 10, 2013 at 9:00 a.m. and setting the hearing on the FTC's *Amicus Curiae* Brief for September 10, 2013 at 9:00 a.m. [Docket No. 91.]

On September 6, 2013, the Court, on its own motion, issued an order continuing the hearing on the Final Approval Motion, the Fee Motion and the FTC's *Amicus Curiae* Brief to October 9, 2013 at 3:30 p.m. [Docket No. 92.]

The Court was open and available on September 9, 2013 at 11:00 a.m. in case any members of the Settlement Class appeared for the final approval hearing that was continued. No members of the Settlement Class appeared before the Court on September 9, 2013.

On October 1, 2013, the FTC filed an *ex parte* application requesting that the Court vacate the October 9, 2013 hearing date and indefinitely stay this action until such time that FTC attorneys could lawfully resume their usual civil litigation functions. [Docket No. 95.] On October 3, 2013, the Court issued a minute order requesting that Plaintiffs and Defendants file a response to the FTC's *ex parte* application by no later than October 4, 2013. [Docket No. 96.] On October 3, 2013, Plaintiffs and Defendants filed a joint opposition to the FTC's *ex parte* application. [Docket No. 97.] On October 6, 2013, the Court denied the FTC's *ex parte* application to continue the hearing on final approval until such time that FTC attorneys could lawfully resume their usual civil litigation functions, in light of the fact that the FTC had already submitted its position in its *amicus curiae* brief. [Docket No. 99.]

On October 8, 2013, the Parties submitted to the Court an Addendum to the Settlement Agreement (the "Addendum"). [Docket No. 101.] The Addendum does

1 not alter any of the terms of the Settlement Agreement. [Docket No. 101.] Instead, the Addendum clarifies and commemorates that Defendants will not use 2 the consumer contact information of Settlement Class members in the future. 3 Specifically, the Addendum provides in relevant part: [Docket No. 101.] 4 5 "Defendants hereby confirm that Defendants had never intended to use, and in fact shall not use, any consumer contact information associated with the Settlement 7 Class Members regarding the three Membership Programs (i.e., the Saving Pays Membership, Century Platinum Membership, and USA Credit Membership) for 8 any purpose whatsoever, except as is necessary to comply with a court order or 9 government subpoena." [Docket No. 101.] 10 11

As set forth in the October 8, 2013 declaration of Jonathan D. Carameros, a total of 1,715 timely unique claims were submitted by members of the Settlement Class [Docket No. 100, at ¶ 6], no requests for exclusions were submitted by members of the Settlement Class [Docket No. 100, at ¶ 7], and no objections were submitted by members of the Settlement Class [Docket No. 100, at ¶ 8].

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

On October 9, 2013, a hearing pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(e) was held before this Court for the following purposes:

- a. to determine whether the Settlement Class satisfies the applicable prerequisites for certification for settlement purposes under Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a) and (b);
- b. to determine whether the proposed settlement as reflected in the Settlement Agreement [found at Docket No. 75-2] and as clarified by the Addendum [found at Docket No. 101], is fair, reasonable, and adequate, and should be finally approved by the Court;
- c. to determine whether a final judgment as provided under Section X of the Settlement Agreement should be entered, and to determine whether the release by the Class, as set forth in Paragraph 3 of Section X of the Settlement Agreement, should be provided;

9

10

11

12 13

14 15

16

17 18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- to consider Plaintiffs' application for an award of attorneys' d. fees, reimbursement of expenses and plaintiff incentive awards [Docket No. 83]; and
- to rule upon such other matters as the Court may deem e. appropriate.

The Court having heard arguments on behalf of the Parties and having reviewed and considered the Settlement Agreement, the Addendum, the Final Approval Motion, the Fee Motion, the FTC's Amicus Curiae Brief, all of the submissions presented with respect to the proposed settlement, and the record in this action, does hereby:

ORDER, ADJUDGE, AND DECREE THAT:

- The Court, for purposes of this Order and Final Judgment ("Final Judgment") adopts the capitalized terms and their definitions set forth in the Settlement Agreement, as executed by the Parties and filed with the Court on April 19, 2013. [Docket No. 75-2].
- 2. The Court has personal jurisdiction over the Plaintiffs and all members of the Settlement Class and the Court has subject matter jurisdiction to approve the proposed settlement, the Settlement Agreement (including all exhibits thereto), and the Addendum.
- The Court finds that the prerequisites of Rule 23(a) and Rule 23(b)(3) 3. of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure have been satisfied in that: (i) the number of members of the Settlement Class is so numerous that joinder of all members is impracticable; (ii) there are questions of law and fact common to the Settlement Class; (iii) the claims of the Plaintiffs are typical of the claims of the Settlement Class; (iv) the Plaintiffs have represented, and will fairly and adequately represent, the interests of the Settlement Class; (v) questions of law and fact common to the Settlement Class predominate over any questions affecting only individual members of the Settlement Class; and (vi) a class action is superior to other

available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of the controversy.

- 4. Pursuant to Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, this action is hereby certified, for settlement purposes only, as a class action on behalf of the following Settlement Class with respect to the claims asserted in this action:
 - All individuals from whom Defendants collected Membership Fees or who incurred Bank Account Fees in connection with a collection or attempted collection of Membership Fees from June 20, 2007 to May 21, 2013.
- 5. Pursuant to Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Court hereby finally certifies plaintiffs Anita White and Deborah Deffenbaugh ("Plaintiffs") as the representatives of the Settlement Class.
- 6. Pursuant to Rule 23(g) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Court hereby appoints Arias Ozzello & Gignac LLP and Kronenberger Rosenfeld, LLP as counsel to the Settlement Class ("Class Counsel").
- 7. The Court finds that Class Counsel and Plaintiffs adequately represented the Settlement Class for purposes of entering into and implementing the proposed settlement, the Settlement Agreement and the Addendum.
- 8. As confirmed in the August 2, 2013 declaration of Jonathan D. Carameros [Docket No. 82-3], the Claims Administrator has complied with the notice process set-forth and approved by the Court in its Preliminary Approval Order. The Court finds that the form and method for notifying the Settlement Class members of the proposed settlement and its terms and conditions was in conformity with this Court's Preliminary Approval Order.
- 9. The Court further finds that the form and method for notifying the Settlement Class members of the proposed settlement and its terms and conditions satisfied the requirements of Rule 23(c)(2)(B) and Rule 23(e)(1) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and due process, and constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances. The Court finds that the notice process was

- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25
- 26
- 27
- 28

- designed to clearly and fully advise the Settlement Class members of their rights and constituted due and sufficient notice to all persons and entities entitled thereto. Further, the Court finds that the claims process set forth in the Settlement
- Agreement was followed and that the process was the best practicable procedure under the circumstances.
- The Court hereby finds that no request for exclusions or "opt-outs" 10. have been submitted by any member of the Settlement Class and further finds that no objections to the proposed settlement have been submitted by any member of the Settlement Class.
- 11. The Court hereby finds that the Settlement Agreement and Addendum were entered into in good faith and that Plaintiffs have satisfied the standards and applicable requirements for final approval of the proposed settlement under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, including Rule 23(e).
- 12. The Court hereby grants final approval of the Settlement Agreement, the Addendum and the settlement described therein. The Settlement Agreement, the Addendum and the proposed settlement are, in all respects, fair, reasonable, and adequate, in the best interests of the Settlement Class, and in compliance with all requirements of due process and applicable law.
- 13. The Court directs that the settlement be consummated in accordance with the terms and conditions of the Settlement Agreement and the Addendum, except that the \$60 Cash Payment set forth in Paragraph 1 of Section III of the Settlement Agreement is increased to \$99. The Court finds that this modification of the proposed settlement, which is made pursuant to the Parties' joint request, is permitted and warranted without the need to provide further notice to the Settlement Class or further notice to the United States Attorney General and the attorney general of each state pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1715 of the Class Action Fairness Act of 2005 because: (i) most claims which are at issue in this action stem from the imposition or attempted imposition of a \$99 "membership fee"; (ii)

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- Paragraph 1 of Section III of the Settlement Agreement provides and advises class members that "the precise Cash Payment shall depend on the claims rate"; (iii) the total number of timely, unique claims submitted in this action are such that the Settlement Fund is sufficient to permit each of the 1,715 claimants to receive \$99.
- The Court hereby orders that any unclaimed funds from the Settlement Fund after all Settlement Costs and Cash Payments are paid shall be distributed in a cy pres distribution to the National Consumer League, such that the entire Settlement Fund shall be distributed following this final approval of the settlement after the Effective Date.
- By no later than 7 days after the Effective Date, Defendants' insurer 15. shall make a single payment of \$1,000,000.00 to an account created by the Settlement Administrator.
- 16. Upon entry of this Order, compensation to the Settlement Class Members who submitted timely and valid claims shall be affected pursuant to the terms of the Settlement Agreement.
- Class Counsel are hereby awarded \$250,000.00 in attorneys' fees, 17. which sum the Court finds to be fair and reasonable, and \$11,760.85 in reimbursement of expenses. The Court specifically finds that these fees and costs are reasonable in light of the benefit provided to the Settlement Class under the settlement. This award and the reimbursement of expenses shall be paid from the Settlement Fund by the Settlement Administrator no later than 7 business days after the Effective Date.
- In addition to any recovery that the Plaintiffs may receive under the 18. settlement and in recognition of the Plaintiffs' efforts on behalf of the Settlement Class, Plaintiffs Anita White and Deborah Deffenbaugh are hereby awarded \$2,500.00 each as an incentive award directly related to Plaintiffs' representation of the Settlement Class. This award shall be paid to Plaintiffs by the Settlement Administrator from the Settlement Fund via checks made out to "Anita White" and

- "Deborah Deffenbaugh" delivered to Class Counsel no later than 7 business days after the Effective Date.
- 19. The Court determines that the Settlement Agreement and the settlement provided for herein and any proceedings taken pursuant thereto are not and should not in any event be offered or received as evidence of, a presumption, concession, or an admission of liability or of any misrepresentation or omission in any statement or written document approved or made by Defendants or any Releasee or the suitability of these or similar claims to class treatment in active litigation and trial; provided, however, that reference may be made to this Settlement Agreement and the settlement provided for herein in such proceedings as may be necessary to effectuate this Agreement.
- 20. To the extent permitted by law and without affecting the other provisions of this Final Judgment, this Final Judgment is intended by the Parties and the Court as binding on and having *res judicata* and preclusive effect in all pending and future lawsuits or other proceedings encompassed by the Release (as set forth in Paragraph 29 of Section I of the Settlement Agreement) maintained by or on behalf of Plaintiffs and all other members of the Settlement Class, as well as their agents, heirs, executors or administrators, successors and assigns.
- 21. The Court finds that Plaintiffs and the Settlement Class (whether or not they submitted a timely and valid claim) have conclusively compromised, settled, dismissed, and released any and all Released Claims against Defendants and the Releasees. Accordingly, on the Effective Date, Plaintiffs and all members of the Settlement Class, shall be barred from asserting any Released Claims against Defendants and/or any Releasee.
- 22. The Court bars and permanently enjoins all members of the Settlement Class from: (i) filing, commencing, prosecuting, intervening in or participating as a plaintiff, claimant or class member in any other lawsuit or administrative, regulatory, arbitration or other proceeding against Defendants in

any jurisdiction based on, relating to or arising out of the claims and causes of action or the facts and circumstances giving rise to the Lawsuits, the Consolidated Action and/or the Released Claims; (ii) from filing, commencing or prosecuting a lawsuit or administrative, regulatory, arbitration or other proceeding against Defendants as a class action on behalf of any Settlement Class Members who have not timely excluded themselves (including by seeking to amend a pending complaint to include class allegations or seeking class certification in a pending action), based on, relating to, or arising out of the claims and causes of action or the facts and circumstances giving rise to the Lawsuits, the Consolidated Action and/or the Released Claims; and (iii) from organizing Settlement Class Members who have not been excluded from the class into a separate class for purposes of pursuing as a purported class action any lawsuit or arbitration or other proceeding (including by seeking to amend a pending complaint to include class allegations or seeking class certification in a pending action) against Defendants based on, relating to, or arising out of the claims and causes of action or the facts and circumstances giving rise to the Lawsuits, the Consolidated Action, and/or the Released Claims.

- 23. The Court hereby dismisses the "Doe" defendants with prejudice.
- 24. The Lawsuits and the Consolidation Action (including all individual and class claims presented thereby) shall be and are hereby dismissed with prejudice on the merits and in full and final discharge of any and all such claims, without fees or costs except as specifically provided herein.

23

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24 | //

//

//

//

//

//

25

26

27

28

Case 2	11-cv-06738-CBM-FFM Document 110 Filed 12/03/13 Page 12 of 12 Page ID #:1512	
1		
2	25. This Order is intended to be a final judgment disposing of the above	
3	captioned action in its entirety, including the Lawsuits and the Consolidated	
4	Action.	
5	26. This Court retains jurisdiction over the parties and the Settlement	
6	Class Members for all matters relating to this action, including the administration,	
7	interpretation, effectuation or enforcement of the Settlement Agreement, the	
8	Addendum and this Order and Final Judgment.	
9		
10	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
11		
12	Dated: $\frac{12/3/2013}{}$	
13		
14	By: Charles By: The Honorable Consuelo B. Marshall	
15	United States District Court Judge	
16	CCIFISCAL	
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
	- 12 ORDER AND FINAL JUDGMENT (11-cv-06738-CBM (FFMx))	